

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA



**ASSOCIATION of
GOVERNMENTS**

Main Office

818 West Seventh Street

12th Floor

Los Angeles, California

90017-3435

t (213) 236-1800

f (213) 236-1825

www.scag.ca.gov

Officers

President

Richard Dixon, Lake Forest

First Vice President

Harry Baldwin, San Gabriel

Second Vice President

Vacant

Immediate Past President

Gary Ovitt, San Bernardino County

Policy Committee Chairs

Administration

Richard Dixon, Lake Forest

Community, Economic and

Human Development

Jon Edney, El Centro

Energy and Environment

Debbie Cook, Huntington Beach

Transportation and Communications

Mike Ten, South Pasadena

MEETING OF THE

AVIATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, June 12, 2008

10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

**John Wayne Airport
Administrative Offices
18601 Airport Way
Suite 116
Santa Ana, CA 92707
949.252.5250**

If members of the public wish to review the attachments or have any questions on any of the agenda items, please contact Michael Armstrong at 213.236.1914 or armstron@scag.ca.gov

Agendas and Minutes for the Aviation Technical Advisory Committee are also available at:

www.scag.ca.gov/committees/atf.htm

SCAG, in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), will accommodate persons who require a modification of accommodation in order to participate in this meeting. If you require such assistance, please contact SCAG at (213) 236-1868 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting to enable SCAG to make reasonable arrangements. To request documents related to this document in an alternative format, please contact (213) 236-1868.

AVIATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

PAGE #

Time

“Any item listed on the agenda (action or information may be acted upon at the discretion of the Committee”

1.0 **CALL TO ORDER** Todd McNamee, ATAC Chair

2.0 **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS** Todd McNamee, ATAC Chair

3.0 **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

Members of the public desiring to speak on an agenda item or items not on the agenda, but within the purview of this committee, must notify the Chair and fill out a speaker's card prior to speaking. Comments will be limited to three minutes and the Chair may limit the total time for comments to 20 minutes.

4.0 **CONSENT CALENDAR**

4.1 Approval of Meeting Minutes from May 22, 2008
Attachment

4.2 ATAC Membership List and Contact Information
Attachment

5.0 **PROJECT REVIEW**
None

6.0 **INFORMATION ITEMS**

6.1	<u>John Wayne Airport Improvement Project Update</u>	John Wayne Airport Staff	20 min.
6.2	<u>Update on Revised Joint Use Agreement For March Inland Port</u>	Gary Gosliga, Airport Director March Inland Port	15 min.
6.3	<u>Update on SCAG Aviation Task Force and Southern California Regional Airport Authority (SCRAA)</u>	Mike Armstrong SCAG Staff	10 min.

AVIATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

ITEM	PAGE #	Time
7.0 <u>ACTION ITEMS</u>		
7.1 <u>Proposed New ATAC Charter</u> Attachment	Mike Armstrong SCAG Staff	45 min.
8.0 <u>MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS/</u> <u>ANNOUNCEMENTS</u>		
9.0 <u>FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS</u>		
Any committee members of staff desiring to place Items on a future agenda may make such a request. Comments should be limited to three minutes.		
10.0 <u>SET NEXT MEETING LOCATION</u>		
11.0 <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>		

John Wayne Airport Administrative Offices

18601 Airport Way, Ste 116, Santa Ana, CA 92707
(949) 252-5250

Continue on **AIRPORT WAY**

Turn **R** **RIGHT** on **PAULARINO AVE**

Turn **L** **LEFT** on **RED HILL AVE**

Turn **L** **LEFT** on **BRISTOL AVE**

Turn **L** **LEFT** on **CAMPUS DR**

Turn **L** **LEFT** on **AIRPORT WAY**

Arrive at **18601 AIRPORT WAY, SANTA ANA,**

NOTE: Park in Terminal A in either A1 or A2 parking lots, go to the lower level, our doors are directly outside of the Terminal "A" doors. There is a huge JWA logo with Administration Offices located just outside our doors.



AVIATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

May 22, 2008
Santa Monica Airport



THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE AVIATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE. AUDIO CASSETTE TAPES OF THE ACTUAL MEETING ARE AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING AT THE SCAG MAIN OFFICE.

The Aviation Technical Advisory Committee of the Southern California Association of Governments held its meeting at the Santa Monica Airport. The meeting was called to order by Mr. Todd McNamee, ATAC Chair and Airport Director of Ventura County.

1.0 Call to Order

Mr. Todd McNamee called the meeting to order at 10:00 A.M.

2.0 Welcome and Introductions

Attendees were welcomed and introductions were made.

3.0 Public Comments

There were no public comment requests.

4.0 Consent Calendar

4.1 Approval of Meeting Minutes from 8 November 2007

Mr. Bryant noted a need for correction to the spelling of his name in the minutes.

Minutes approved.

4.2 ATAC Membership List and Contact Information

5.0 Project Review

None

6.0 Information Items

6.1 Santa Monica Airport Update

Mr. Bob Trimborn, Santa Monica Airport, welcomed everyone and provided historical background on Santa Monica airport. He specifically noted that since the facility was designed to accommodate military aircraft built for wartime operations, runway safety areas and provisions were rarely considered. He began to discuss recent legal issues between Santa Monica Airport and the FAA and U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) by showing a graphic illustrating the proximity of existing homes (approximately 300 feet) to the ends of the runway. He noted that a 40-foot grade separation existed between the runway and the surrounding residential areas. Mr. Trimborn said that Santa Monica Airport is severely encroached, and while other issues such as noise and emissions issues are very serious to the local community, this presentation would focus on safety and the reasons for the current legal case.

Runway safety zones are areas on the ends of runways designed to handle undershoots or overshoots. Their size is based upon the airport's designed aircraft. Santa Monica Airport was designed for BII aircraft with approach speeds of less than 121 knots. The current runway safety zones areas were installed at 300 feet on both ends of the runway when the Airport Master Plan was completed in the early 1980s. Mr. Trimborn said that for C and D category aircraft, runway safety zones require 1,000 feet of flat pavement on either end of the runway or an equivalent system to arrest aircraft called EMAS (Engineered Material Arresting Systems), or soft concrete. Santa Monica Airport, because of existing encroachment and proximity to residential areas, does not have the adequate space required by the FAA to provide 1,000 feet for safety areas at both ends of the runway for the over 9,000 Category C and D aircraft that use the airport. In 2000, a consultant was hired to look at the airport and its physical layout to determine how the physical plan conformed to current design standards. The lack of safety areas was one of the major deficiencies identified. Mr. Trimborn noted that the cost to build structures that would provide 1,000-foot safety zones would be nearly \$1 billion. He also pointed out that a runway safety zone, designed to protect aircraft, was not the same as a runway protection zone which is designed to protect communities. Santa Monica airport has neither zone. The cost to provide a runway protection zone would require the purchase of 28 acres of land and cost approximately \$750 million. He then noted some accidents had occurred at other airports and that if safety zones been in place, those accidents might have been avoided. Mr. Trimborn also showed illustrations of what the Santa Monica Airport would look like with safety zones.

In 1996, due to fractional ownership which provided easy access to business jets, jet operations at Santa Monica Airport began to increase. The airport has been trying to address runway safety and come up with appropriate safety areas with the FAA since 2000 to address the increase in jet operations. To investigate solutions to the airport's physical limitations, the airport developed a program called the Air Traffic Performance Program to consider limiting operations to those aircraft consistent with the airport's use (Category BII and below) and creating the 300 foot runway safety zones needed to meet FAA standards. When Santa Monica Airport brought the concept to the Airport Commission, an advisory body to the Santa Monica City Council, the FAA filed a Part 16 action against the airport, which required response though no law was enacted and no ordinance was put in place. Mr. Trimborn said that when the airport became aware that it did not meet required safety standards, it met with the FAA Western Pacific Region

to determine what to do to address the safety issue. The FAA offered no comments other than to say that the airport was safe. However, as growth increased, the issue became more acute and Santa Monica Airport contacted FAA in Washington, D.C. Following a visit from an FAA official later, substantive discussions to address the safety issues with technical solutions began.

Mr. Rodine asked Santa Monica Airport's ALP had a runway protection zone. He said that some of the homes near the airport appeared to be new construction. He noted that if newer homes were in the runway protection zone depicted on the ALP, those homes would have to file a 7460 before doing any remodeling or renovation. He expressed surprise that the FAA allowed those actions. Mr. Trimborn said that the FAA did not stop it and that most of the homes were from the 1930s and 1940s and had been modernized.

Mr Trimborn said that Santa Monica airport has been working with the FAA to develop safety areas using various means to achieve full-section safety areas. One-thousand foot safety zones are not plausible as the runway would have be trimmed to 3,000 feet and Category C and D aircraft would not be able to land. EMAS systems have been explored. These systems have become effective for aircraft 12,500 pounds and higher, an improvement over previous aircraft weight requirements of 50,000 pounds and higher. However, safety areas to accommodate lighter aircraft still had to be considered. This led to a focus on 300-foot safety areas on each end of the runway using some type of EMAS system. The FAA originally proposed use of 135 feet of EMAS at only the departure end of the runway. This did not meet the 70 knot standard which the full section EMAS would accommodate. Through a series negotiations, the concept of 250 feet of EMAS at the west end at 600 feet of declared distances at the east end of the runway emerged. The idea was presented to the users of the airport at the FAA regional office. The users felt that the 600 feet declared distance at the east end of the runway created an invalid runway length and that such an operational issue was intolerable. On the day that Santa Monica Airport planned to present this concept plan to the Airport Commission and the public, the FAA issued a statement to the airport saying that it was backing away from the concept and supporting the original idea of using 135 feet of EMAS. Mr. Brian Armstrong from the FAA presented this to the Airport Commission that night. Mr. Trimborn then showed an illustration depicting that the majority of planes with operations at Santa Monica Airport tend to fly less than 1,000 nautical miles with only a small percentage going to the East Coast. He also showed a draft of the of the concept EMAS system being discussed with the FAA along with geometric designs and their potential implications.

The Santa Monica City Council rejected the FAA's plans. Staff met with key legislators (Oberstar, Waxman, and Harman) to discuss what could be done with the FAA to create a safety solution for the airport. Following the meetings, a proposal was made for 250 feet of EMAS at the west end of the runway and no safety area or declared distance area at the east end of the runway. Staff could not support the recommendation. The Santa Monica City Council proceeded to perform a second reading of an ordinance done in November 2007 which would ban Category C and D aircraft from the airport. Based upon City Council's approval of the ordinance, operations of Category C and D aircraft at the airport would be a violation of law and enforced as a misdemeanor. The FAA got a temporary restraining order preventing the City from implementing the ordinance. A federal preliminary injunction was also recently issued. The City will now appear in the Ninth Circuit Court to argue the merits of the case.

Dr. Harris said that 95 percent of operations at Santa Monica Airport are on Runway 1 which is an east-west configuration. Because of the gradient of the runway, most problems would be for aircraft arriving from the east on runway 2 and overshooting the western end of the runway. Aircraft landing eastwardly would face an uphill grade, and most aircraft, even larger ones, do not come close to the end of the runway. To overshoot the east end of the runway, gross misjudgment would have to occur. If an EMAS system were to be put in place, it would be important to place such a system on the west but not necessarily the east end.

Mr. Kunze asked about the thinking behind banning aircraft versus re-marking the runway to create safety areas. Mr. Trimborn said that an updated ALP was submitted to the region showing the displaced thresholds to create safety areas but no response had been received. Mr. Kenton asked about the response of insurance companies concerning the issue. Mr. Trimborn said he did not understand why there did not seem to be an issue with the insurance carriers. Mr. Burkhart commented that all stakeholders should familiarize themselves with the history of what has happened at Santa Monica Airport and noted that the City of Santa Monica has some good questions to ask concerning the temporary restraining order that was issued. He said that NBAA supported any actions that could be done for safety and said that Santa Monica Airport was considered a safe airport. Speaking on his own, not for NBAA, Mr. Burkhart asked about the consequences of an aircraft overshooting the runway now. Mr. Trimborn talked about some past issues the airport had faced. He noted that Santa Monica Airport used FAA standards as a guide for runway safety areas. He said that while a Category C or D aircraft has never gone off the end of the runway, it is not an option to allow an incident to occur before acting. In addition to safety concerns, such an incident would place the future of the airport in jeopardy. He said that the number of operations for larger aircraft was minimal and that safety areas for smaller aircraft could be easily accommodated. However, safety areas for larger aircraft must be considered. Mr. Trimborn was asked if engineering estimates were obtained for extending the runway with bridge options and about physical limitations, assuming feasible costs. He said that costs were very high and there were challenges in the actual design and the necessity of beginning to take homes to accommodate approximately thirteen aircraft operations daily would not be politically feasible.

Analysis was done assuming a 4,500-foot runway with 275 feet of EMAS and a 300-foot safety area. The determination was made that every aircraft currently using the airport could continue to do so but would not be able to make it to the East Coast nonstop. The results of the assessment were showed that a decision needed to be made between access and convenience. This proposal is still under discussion which the FAA has been asked to join. Mr. Rodine commented that if Bundy Drive at the end of the runway were relocated to make a 90-degree turn eastward before the end of the runway and then make a left turn to realign with its natural flow just before Pico and Ocean Park instead of its current configuration which curves around the end of the runway, it appears that 1,000 feet of runway could be gained. He asked if that 1,000 feet, with the taking of few homes, would be enough to accommodate aircraft with safety zones at both ends of the runway. Mr. Trimborn answered that there would be political cost and disruptions to a major transportation corridor are not truly feasible.

6.2 Update on San Diego/Tijuana Cross-Border Airport Terminal Study

Mr. Ryan Hall, San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA), introduced himself and indicated that he would provide an update on the San Diego-Tijuana Cross-Border Terminal Study that he had previously presented to ATAC. He said that the Board of the SDCRAA asked to staff to consider how many people would use a cross-border facility with a connection between San Diego and Tijuana. He said that during recent investigations into site selection opportunities for the San Diego area, Tijuana surfaced as a potential solution for some of the areas demand issues. Following the completion of the site selection process, SDCRAA staff, under direction from its Board and to address ideas for its constituency, began a \$370,000 market-demand study to determine the viability of a potential cross-border facility.

The scope of work for the project had five tasks: The first task was to define existing and future conditions using the San Diego International Airport (SDIA) master plan and the Tijuana International Airport (TIJ) master plan. The second task called for the completion of a series of stakeholder interviews to understand passenger trends at TIJ. The third task, which constituted the majority of the project, was data collection through telephone and passenger intercept surveys for both San Diego and Tijuana. Task four determined market demand and the final task involved consideration of factors that might affect the identified market demand.

The study found that under all circumstances, SDIA would remain the premier airport in the area for U.S. domestic service. Mr. Ryan noted that TIJ is owned by a private corporation which recently purchased the land adjacent to the airport on the U.S. side of the border. TIJ currently operates as a single-runway airport (9,700-foot runway) and has approximately twenty-four nonstop destinations in Mexico plus service to Tokyo. The Tokyo flight originates in Mexico City and passes through TIJ on to Japan. The flight, according to Aeromexico has been very successful, appealing particularly to Japanese business people flying to the U.S.-Mexico border region where numerous maquiladoras are located. Mexico has also seen a surge in low-cost carriers which has resulted in rapid growth for TIJ. Stakeholders in both the San Diego area and northern Mexico indicated that passengers from all over Southern California were willing to drive to TIJ because of low fares and robust schedules to Mexican destinations. Of the twenty four destinations in Mexico served from TIJ, ten are served in the region only by TIJ. The study provided interesting insight into the multimodal aspect of service at TIJ as well. It is common for passengers to fly domestically in Mexico to Tijuana and then board buses to cross the border for U.S. destinations. The buses are often marketed with the same branding as the airline that the passengers used to arrive in Tijuana. This demand is drawn from passengers who originally used buses for their entire trip from Mexico to the U.S.

Mr. Hall said that care was taken to ensure the accuracy and statistical significance of the surveys in terms of the demographics in the San Diego County region. Some telephone surveys were also done for Imperial County. Results of the surveys showed that approximately forty-eight percent of people might use some type of cross-border connection while about thirty percent said they would never use TIJ or a cross-border facility. The consultant tried to correlate the extreme differences in opinions about a cross-border connection into a propensity to travel. The concept of a cross-border facility was most appealing to Hispanics, those under the age of 35, urban residents, those who had used TIJ previously, and those who spoke some Spanish.

Following completion of the surveys, the consultant team completed a draft forecast. The forecasts indicated growth in TIJ traffic from the U.S. regardless of the completion of a cross-border terminal. Passengers were not likely to use TIJ until SDIA reaches capacity. Contrary to the original thought that a cross-border facility might allow penetration into markets not currently served by SDIA, the consultant found that growth would likely be seen in markets such as the Bay Area, Las Vegas, Phoenix, and Midwestern hubs that already have a high density level of service from SDIA. Total U.S. demand with a cross-border connection was projected to be 3.2 million air passengers (MAP) in 2020 and 6.4 MAP in 2030. Estimates assumed that SDIA would reach a natural capacity around 2022. Induced demand from completion of the cross-border facility was approximately 1 MAP in 2020 and 3 MAP in 2030. The captured demand with a cross-border connection likely stemmed from passengers who drive to Los Angeles to fly to Mexican destinations. The projected economic impacts to the region would be significant. Next steps include a recommendation from staff to incorporate the concept into the regional aviation strategic plan. The Board will have to decide about funding of any potential future studies that might address more detailed issues including security.

Mr. Armstrong asked if the analysis considered the possibility of more flight offerings from TIJ to European and Asian destinations to serve the needs of international passengers. Mr. Hall answered that findings indicated that even with the Tijuana market, demand for European markets could still be met from SDIA. He noted that current data for SDIA was used as the baseline in determining the demand that would be served by the airport. The demand exceeding natural capacity at SDIA was the driving factor in projected growth for TIJ to destinations already highly served. Mr. McNamee asked about the likelihood of the SDCRAA supporting follow-up studies. Mr. Hall responded that funding issues would likely be the determining factor. This study was funded with remaining monies from the site selection study and to receive FAA money, the project has to be capacity-enhancing. The Board could fund it depending on its priorities. Mr. Trimbore asked if the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) was part of the analysis. Mr. Hall responded that the TSA was a member of the technical advisory committee to the study but since the study was primarily focused on market demand, TSA did not offer a large amount of input. Staff would recommend that any follow-on studies look at security in more detail. Mr. Rodine commented that the one cross-border airport in Geneva, Switzerland appeared to operate very efficiently and should be looked at as a case study. Mr. Burkhart said the airport operations seemed feasible but noted that other concerns including safety and security should be strongly considered.

6.3 Update on General Aviation Survey

Mr. Jones, SCAG staff, indicated that this was a follow-up from previous ATAC meetings about SCAG's general aviation survey being circulated among regional airports. He asked everyone to complete the surveys. He said that the SCAG staff member who had previously contacted the airports about completing the survey had left. Mr. Jones said that he would continue to contact the airports to provide any help needed to finish the surveys. SCAG would like to complete the surveys by the end of June and then make the data available to ATAC.

6.4 Regional Aviation Activity 200-2007

Mr. Armstrong, SCAG staff, updated the group on regional aviation data compiled from regional airport websites. He said that current trends were consistent with expectations. He said that a significant milestone had been achieved as the regional passenger market exceeded 2001 levels though Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) had not. However, passenger traffic has increased there. Passenger traffic has grown at an approximate rate of about five percent annually from 2003 through 2007 for regional airports. Mr. Armstrong noted that higher fuel prices may have a significant effect on demand as costs rise and carriers begin to leave the market or consolidate and decrease flights.

Cargo growth has remained stagnant since 2003. Mr. Armstrong said he did not know the reason for the low growth but speculated that more international cargo that previously moved by air was now traveling by ship because of costs and just-in-time supply chain systems. Also, air cargo now may travel through the Arctic Circle and Alaska to change planes and refuel before arriving at destinations in the Midwest. Domestic cargo that was once air cargo may now be moving by trucks and trains. There has been a dramatic downturn in overnight and next-day cargo with a trend toward increased second- and third-day time-definite deliveries. Additionally, the use of more long-range aircraft is allowing cargo to be flown over the region to other destinations.

Operations at regional airports have shown an overall increase of about 2.4 percent which is consistent with passenger growth. A general trend toward a loss of general aviation at urban airports has continued, particularly at Bob Hope and John Wayne Airports. However, Long Beach experienced nearly a 13 percent increase. In response to a question concerning Bob Hope Airport, Mr. Armstrong confirmed that the airport was losing general aviation operations but stated that there was no runway capacity problem. Mr. McNamee noted that the loss in general aviation operations seems to be consistent downward trend. He stated some reasons might be an increase in light airplanes and an older pilot population living on fixed incomes specifically at Camarillo Airport. Mr. Hall said that SDIA had 227,000 operations last year operations which was relatively flat but there was growth in general aviation operations.

7.0 Action Items

7.1 Proposed New ATAC Charter

Mr. McNamee said that he had received input from some airports on the proposed new ATAC charter. He specifically noted John Wayne Airport had requested that no formal action to adopt new charter be taken. Mr. McNamee said that this was not the original intent. The purpose for this item was to define what ATAC currently is and use that determination to look at ways to increase participation which has declined over the past years. Also, with the proposed dissolution of the Southern California Regional Aviation Authority (SCRAA), the group planned to discuss whether a new, higher-level role might be appropriate for ATAC. Mr. McNamee proposed that no formal action be taken at this meeting but instead opened the forum to the group for discussion and input. He noted that Mr. Armstrong had generated a memorandum detailing the background of ATAC and the potential role of the group. Mr. McNamee suggested

that the majority of the next ATAC meeting be set aside to discuss what ATAC should be and should become.

Mr. Armstrong agreed that no action should be taken at this meeting of the proposed new ATAC charter. SCAG is currently in the process of having all task forces and committees develop new charters. Mr. Armstrong said that he could not find any existing bylaws for ATAC and that group would need to initiate a new set of bylaws. Historically, ATAC was comprised of representatives from all airports, commercial and non-commercial, the FAA, and the California Division of Aeronautics. ATAC met monthly in the past but has recently moved to meeting every other month. The group continues to meet at various airports throughout the region. Mr. Armstrong felt that one of the reasons that participation in the group had declined was the difficulty in getting around the region to attend the meetings. There was discussion noting that meetings occurred on Fridays instead of Thursdays in the past which often allowed travel around the region to be more acceptable as many attendees could begin their weekend following the meeting.

Mr. Armstrong recommended that the ATAC membership be expanded and noted that the SDCRAA had already been invited to join the group. SCAG's legal group stated that nothing in SCAG's bylaws would preclude participants outside of SCAG's region to be eligible as members of the committee with voting privileges. Mr. Armstrong recommended that constituents that should be considered as part of expanded membership include the National Business Aviation Association (NBAA), Aircraft Owner and Pilots Association (AOPA), California State University-Los Angeles Aviation Department, Transportation Security Administration (TSA), and California Pilots Association (CalPilots). Mr. Robert Rodine suggested inclusion of representatives for the airlines and aircraft manufacturers. There was some concern about the potential participation of those groups. Mr. Rodine noted that in other forums, such as the Los Angeles Economic Development Corporation (LAEDC), the groups had been active. Mr. Trimborn said he supported the idea of moving to a broader audience and the group should develop protocols about how appointments to ATAC would be made. Mr. Armstrong said that ATAC had previously been flexible in allowing the appointing entities determine who their representatives to ATAC would be. Mr. Trimborn said that the person representing a group to ATAC should have some authorization from their organization acknowledging that that individual represented the entity. Mr. Kenton said that since SCAG sponsored the Southern California Airspace Users Working Group (SCAUWG), it was represented on the ATAC committee. Mr. Armstrong said that ATAC could have a member from the SCAUWG if the committee agreed. Mr. Trimborn said that the group was an advisory committee and needed to consider what members would contribute most significantly in providing advice, adding aerospace could be beneficial. Other groups that were mentioned for consideration as part of ATAC were the Air Transport Association (ATA), General Aviation Manufacturing Association (GAMA), and Association of California Airports (ACA). Mr. McNamee said that this discussion was a good start and suggested that this topic be the main agenda for the next ATAC meeting and noted that a number of airport representatives, who would provide meaningful input, were unable to attend this meeting.

Creating a broader agenda to attract more diverse participation was also discussed. The group agreed that some actions could be taken such as inviting guest speakers, such airline operators and manufacturers. Mr. Armstrong told the group that this was constrained by staff limitations.

Mr. Kunze stated that one focus ATAC should have is to define the void left by SCRAA what the committee should consider to fill that void. Mr. Kunze said there should also be discussion on whether ATAC or the Aviation Task Force should fill the void. Mr. McNamee suggested that SCRAA had considered ATAC as a standing committee and this could be further discussed by the group. Mr. Kunze said that SCRAA, or another entity, could identify and support ground access projects for regionalization, support airline outreach for new service at airports desiring the service, and support the marketing of outlying airports. He felt that these tasks would likely be acceptable to stakeholders. Mr. Armstrong said that the Regional Airport Management Action Plan being done by SCAG would be looking at these issues, noting that SCAG had limited authority in implementing projects. Most projects found in SCAG's RTP are provided by the county transportation commissions. He said that it would be important to begin to understand how county transportation commissions interact with airports. Ms. McHargue briefly talked about how LAWA works with Metro.

Mr. McNamee indicated that any additional comments or suggestions could be forwarded to SCAG and this item would be further discussed at the next ATAC meeting.

7.2 Proposed FAA AIP Aviation Systems Planning Grant Proposal

Mr. Mike Armstrong, SCAG staff, said that SCAG planned to submit another aviation system planning grant proposal to the FAA. The last two grant proposals were not approved or submitted to FAA headquarters by the FAA Western Pacific Region. The former FAA Western Pacific airport director was not supportive of aviation system planning and that office was being questioned as to the value that SCAG had brought based on previous grant awards. However, the FAA Western Pacific office has a new airport director who is supportive of aviation system planning efforts, particularly if the efforts can be used to define roles for airports in the regional aviation system so that the FAA can use the definition of roles in their AIP grants process. It is encouraging to have a director supporting the idea and that FAA plans to incorporate the work that the grant money is used to complete. Mr. Armstrong stated this proposal was similar to the previous proposal with the addition of using general aviation work being completed by SCAG. This included data from the 2008 Aviation Survey and work being done to look at the relationship between general aviation pilot's addresses and the locations of their aircraft. The group offered suggestions for gathering the data. Mr. Kunze said that John Wayne and Long Beach had no direct relationship with aircraft-owner tenants but would be willing to help as much as they could. Mr. Kenton stated that the SCAUWG was not included in the listing of those involved in the grant proposal. Mr. Armstrong said that one of the new sections of the proposal was focused on completing an updated general aviation forecast. SCAG is looking to do more extensive forecasts than in the past with a focus on corporate aviation and Very Light Jets (VLJ). Mr. Armstrong confirmed that the model does assume very high oil prices but that these assumptions can be modified. The proposal also plans to look at key environmental impacts at airports experiencing growth in corporate aviation. Finally, determining roles for

general aviation airports for the regional system will be considered. The grant proposal should be submitted soon and the FAA has it listed as a line item.

Mr. McNamee suggested doing comparisons of general aviation forecasts with the FAA. Mr. Armstrong said that work in the proposal can be updated to look at what is contained in airports capital improvement plans. Mr. Kunze stated that he was concerned about SCAG forecasting growth and making recommendations to Long Beach about actions to take specifically regarding noise and air quality. Mr. Armstrong agreed that this may be issue and said he would revise the language to make the activities more generic in nature. Mr. Kunze expressed a similar concern about looking at land availability in and around airports and the potential for on-airport facility upgrades. Mr. Kunze suggested adding language noting that this would be based upon the airport proprietor's plans only. Mr. Armstrong said this was intended to look at possible business park developments around airports with growing corporate aviation. Based upon suggestions, he indicated that the proposal could show that SCAG could do environmental analysis based upon forecast itself. There was some concern was about the political implications of looking at land use availability. Some minor grammatical edits were also suggested.

There was also discussion about the Aviation Task Force, SCAG's aviation policy committee. He noted that the group had provided input in SCAG's 2008 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). While group is currently not meeting, he noted that the new SCAG president, Richard Dixon, Lake Forest, is interested in elevating regional aviation issues to a high level.

8.0 Miscellaneous Items/Announcements

Dr. Harris announced that he offered a monthly class on CPR and first aid under the auspices of the Emergency Volunteer Air Corps (EVAC), American Red Cross (ARC), and the Santa Monica Airport Administration. Everyone was invited to the conference room at the Santa Monica Air Center (Barker Hangar) at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 27, 2008 to take part. The class is free and upon completion of the course, participants would be certified by the ARC for adult CPR for one year.

Mr. Goslinga said that in 2004 the FAA identified March Inland Port as being in non-compliance with quick claim deeds from property covenants and grant assurances and placed March Inland Port on the non-compliance list. March Inland Port had received four grants prior to this with those grants based on a joint-use agreement with the military. The joint-use agreement had not changed since it was originally signed in 1997. That document began to be used across the country as a template for joint-use agreements which led the FAA to identify that restricting general aviation aircraft at March Inland Port put the facility in non-compliance specifically related to the grants. As a result, all grants were shut down. Since 2004, March Inland Port has worked with the wing commanders for the military. For the past one-and-a-half years, an amendment to the joint use agreement has been circulating between the FAA, the Pentagon, and the U.S. Air Force. On May 14, the March Joint Powers Commission approved the amendment to allow general aviation and corporate aircraft onto the March Air Reserve Base field under March Inland Port. The amendment has been executed by the March Joint Powers Commission.

Mr. Armstrong asked Mr.Gosliga if the item could be placed on the agenda for the next ATAC meeting to get a full report. Mr. Gosliga agreed.

9.0 Future Agenda Items

10.0 Set Next Meeting Location

The next ATAC meeting was scheduled for June 12, 2008 at a location to be determined.

11.0 Adjournment

Mr. McNamee adjourned the meeting at 12:11 P.M.

ATAC Members Present:

**Attendance based on ATAC sign-in sheet.*

Todd McNamee	Ventura County
Bob Trimborn	Santa Monica Airport
Robert L. Rodine	The Polaris Group
Keith Mew	CSU, Los Angeles
Gary Gosliga	March JPA
Chris Kunze	Long Beach Airport
Michael Armstrong	SCAG

Others Present:

Dan Burkhart	NBAA
Bernard Harris	Santa Monica Airport
Christine Eberhard	Communiquest
Mario Fabila	Santa Monica Airport
James Bryant	DHS/TSA/LAX
Ryan Hall	San Diego International Airport
Travis Wattles	San Diego International Airport
Ron Kochevar	LAWA (Retired)
Paula McHargue	LAWA
Leia Umass	John Wayne Airport
Jack Kenton	CalPilots/Southern California Airspace Users Working Group
Mike Jones	SCAG

MEMO

DATE: June 12, 2008

TO: Aviation Technical Advisory Committee

FROM: Michael Armstrong, Aviation Program Manager
213-236-1914/armstron@scag.ca.gov

SUBJECT: Proposed New Charter for ATAC

BACKGROUND:

On January 31, 2008, the Board of the Southern California Regional Airport Authority (SCRAA) voted to formally disband. As discussed at the last ATAC meeting on March 13, 2008, the dissolution of the SCRAA presents an opportunity and implicit obligation for ATAC to expand the scope of its responsibilities and membership, to help fill the void left by the defunct SCRAA by promoting and advancing regional aviation decentralization.

SCAG aviation staff conducted a search of existing formal bylaws for ATAC and unfortunately could not find any; they either did not exist or have been lost. Consequently, ATAC can assume that it is working from a clean slate in developing a new charter for the committee that specifies its responsibilities, membership, relationship to SCAG policy committees, meeting schedule and other attributes.

Currently, the formal ATAC membership is comprised of airport management representatives from commercial and non-commercial airports in the region, and representatives from the FAA and the State Division of Aeronautics. SCAG has not appointed ATAC representatives, and these entities have been free to appoint whomever they choose to represent them at ATAC meetings (there is a formal ATAC membership list that is continually updated). At the last ATAC meeting it was moved and approved to invite representatives from the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority and San Diego County Airport to join and participate in ATAC as full voting members (invitation letters have been sent). Traditionally ATAC discusses aviation issues of a technical nature that impact the region's commercial and non-commercial airports. It forwards recommendations on those issues to SCAG's Transportation and Communications Committee, and more recently the Aviation Task Force (which has representation from ATAC, as well as elected officials and representatives from the aviation industry). ATAC is SCAG's oldest technical advisory committee—it has met on a fairly continuous basis for about 30 years. It has met almost every month at different commercial and non-commercial airports in the region, although over the last several years it has met less often, and some of the meetings have been at the SCAG offices.

RECOMMENDED NEW ATAC CHARTER

Purpose of the Committee

To provide technical recommendations to the SCAG Aviation Task Force and Transportation and Communications Committee on long-range regional aviation plans and demand forecasts, regional aviation studies, current regional aviation issues, and strategies to implement adopted regional aviation plans

MEMO

including ground access project prioritization, airport marketing, inter-agency coordination, and new aviation legislation.

Responsibilities

The Committee will carry out the following responsibilities:

- Review and comment on drafts of all aviation-related technical reports developed by SCAG aviation staff and their consultants including, but not limited, to aviation demand forecasts, airport capacity analyses, environmental analyses, airport ground access studies, airport marketing studies, airport management studies, inter-governmental relations studies, and implementation action plans, and forward related recommendations to the Aviation Task Force and the Transportation and Communications Committee.
- Review and comment on proposed parameters and assumptions used to generate new aviation demand forecasts for the Aviation Element of the Regional Transportation Plan, and forward related recommendations to the Aviation Task Force and Transportation and Communications Committee.
- Review and comment on proposed strategies to implement adopted regional aviation plan including ground access project prioritization, airport marketing, inter-agency coordination, and new aviation legislation, and forward related recommendations to the Aviation Task Force and Transportation and Communications Committee
- Review and comment on new aviation and airport planning and development projects
- Provide a forum for the exchange of information and viewpoints on aviation issues and topics of current interest, as well as the dissemination of information on new aviation technology and airport management best practices, for ATAC members and other interested parties.

Composition

The Committee will be comprised of one representatives from each commercial and general aviation airport in the region, as well as representatives from the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority, San Diego County Airports, the State of California Division of Aeronautics, the Federal Aviation Administration Western-Pacific Region, the National Business Aviation Association, the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, the Association of California Airports, the California Pilots Association, the Southern California Airspace Working Group, the Air Transport Association, the General Aviation Manufacturing Association, the Federal Transportation Security Administration, and the California State University Los Angeles Aviation Administration Program. Each of these entities will be formally invited by SCAG to appoint a designated representative and alternate to serve on the Committee. New members can be added to the Committee by a simple majority vote of the Committee members as appropriate, such as aircraft manufacturers, military air base representatives, representatives from economic development organizations, representatives from ground transportation service providers, and representatives from other aviation-related organizations.

Meetings

The Committee will meet on a bi-monthly (every other month) basis at different airport locations around the region, as well as the SCAG offices. The Committee will have the authority to convene additional meetings as circumstances require. All Committee members are expected to attend each meeting. The Committee will invite others to attend meetings and provide pertinent information as needed, including

MEMO

SCAG non-aviation staff. Meeting agendas will be prepared and provided in advance to members by SCAG aviation staff, along with appropriate briefing materials in accordance with the Brown Act. Minutes of each meeting will be prepared and made available to the public.